

REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-4, 6-15 and 17-46 remain in the application. Claims 20-46 are new, including independent claims 20 and 35, and consideration of new claims 20-46 is respectfully requested. Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly describe the claimed invention. Claim 15 has been amended to a device claim as opposed to a use claim. Applicant appreciates and acknowledges the Examiner's indication of patentable subject matter in claims 4-6.

New claims 20-46 are very similar to the existing claims. However, new independent claim 20 includes a pressing belt exit section being arranged to be capable to support and convey objects away from an exit point. Independent claim 35 includes both a pressing belt entry section and exit section. The pressing belt entry section and exit section are arranged to be capable to support and convey objects to an entry point and away from an exit point, respectively.

Claim Rejections

Claim 15 stands rejected as being an improper process claim and for not having any definitive process steps. Claim 15 has been amended to be a device (installation) claim. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 15 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 1 has been rejected for including potentially alternative language. Claim 1 has been amended to remove language that could potentially be considered alternative language.

Claim 2 has been rejected for stating that the first part of the removal means is a pivoting ramp when in claim 1 at least a part of the removal means is claimed as a pressing belt. Claim 1 has been amended to remove this claim language, thus, claims 1 and 2 are not inconsistent.

Claim 3 has been rejected because the claim language "the downstream sides of the support elements" lacks antecedent basis. Claim 3 has been amended to remove the word "the" at the beginning of this phrase.

Claim 6 has been rejected as being ambiguous because the claimed string is not stating as being in the form of a closed loop. Claim 6 has been amended to state that the string is in the form of a closed loop.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-19 under §112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 10-13, 15, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by published PCT application WO 00/64738 (hereinafter the '738 publication) For the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is traversed.

The '738 publication is directed to a device comprising a processing drum, a pressing belt cooperating with the drum and supply and removal means. The pressing belt runs over an entry pulley (12) which is distanced from the drum periphery and there is a pressing belt portion which extends from the entry pulley to the drum periphery. However, this pressing belt portion extends above the objects

to be processed such that it cannot support or convey the objects. The pressing belt further runs over an exit pulley 14, which is arranged at a distance from the drum periphery but not adjoining the removal means 34 for which reason it is not able to support and convey the objects after processing.

Regarding claim 1, the '738 publication fails to disclose "a pressing belt entry section being arranged to be capable to support and convey the objects to the entry point", as required. Rather, the '738 publication discloses a support roller 12 located above the entry position and a pressing belt that also runs above the entry position. Newspapers 2 enter the apparatus between support rollers 12 and 28, but once passing through, drop below the pressing belt and are not able to be supported and conveyed by the pressing belt.

Because this feature of the claimed installation is not disclosed by the '738 publication, the invention of claim 1 is not anticipated. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 over the '738 publication is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-13, 15, 17 and 18 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and are believed to be allowable at least for the reasons stated above. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10-13, 15, 17 and 18 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 7, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Great Britain Patent 1409077 to Winnemoller (hereinafter Winnemoller). For the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is traversed.

Winnemoller discloses a device comprising a processing drum, pressing belt cooperating with the drum and supply and removal means, wherein the diameter of

the drum is adjustable. The pressing belt runs over an entry pulley and an exit pulley, which at maximum drum diameter are arranged without distance from the drum periphery. When the drum diameter is smaller, there are belt sections extending from the entry pulley to the drum periphery and from the drum periphery to the exit pulley. However, these belt sections are both positioned above the objects and are therefore unable to support and convey the objects.

Regarding claim 1, Winnemoller fails to disclose "a pressing belt entry section being arranged to be capable to support and convey the objects to the entry point", as required. Rather, Winnemoller neither discloses a pressing belt section which supports and conveys the objects to be processed to the drum periphery nor even a pressing belt section which supports and conveys the processed objects away from the drum periphery.

Because this feature of the claimed installation is not disclosed by Winnemoller, the invention of claim 1 is not anticipated. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 over Winnemoller is respectfully requested.

Claims 7 and 8 depend directly from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable at least for the reasons stated above.

Claims 2 and 3 stand rejected as being unpatentable over the '738 publication in view of German patent 3528634 to Optima (hereinafter Optima). For the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is traversed.

Optima discloses a device comprising a processing drum and supply and removal means. The drum does not co-operate with a pressing belt. Instead there are pivoting pressing tools arranged on the periphery of the drum.

Claims 2 and 3 depend directly from claim 1 and claim 1 includes the feature

"a pressing belt entry section being arranged to be capable to support and convey the objects to the entry point". Even if the references were combined in the manner stated by the Examiner, the claimed invention would not be taught. As previously stated, the '738 publication does not teach this feature of the invention. Additionally, Optima does not disclose a pressing belt. Thus, the proposed combination also does not teach or suggest "a pressing belt entry section being arranged to be capable to support and convey the objects to the entry point".

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2 and 3 is respectfully requested.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the publication '738. For the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is traversed. Claim 9 depends directly from claim 1.

Regarding claim 1, the '738 publication fails to teach or suggest "a pressing belt entry section being arranged to be capable to support and convey the objects to the entry point", as required. Rather, the '738 publication discloses a support roller 12 located above the entry position and a pressing belt that also runs above the entry position. Newspapers 2 enter the apparatus between support rollers 12 and 28, but once passing through, drop below the pressing belt and are not able to be supported and conveyed by the pressing belt.

Because this feature of the claimed installation is not taught or suggested by the '738 publication, the invention of claim 1 is not anticipated. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 9 over the '738 publication is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application

is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If clarification of the amendment or application is desired, or if issues are present which the Examiner believes may be quickly resolved, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 18-0160, our Order No. FRR-15905.

Respectfully submitted,

RANKIN, HILL, PORTER & CLARK LLP

By /James A. Balazs/
James A. Balazs, Reg. No. 47401

4080 Erie Street
Willoughby, Ohio 44094-7836
(216) 566-9700